arXiv:1411.5455v1 [cs.CG] 20 Nov 2014

Generalized β-skeletons *

Mirosław Kowaluk and Gabriela Majewska

Institute of Informatics, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland, kowaluk@mimum.edu.pl
gm248309@students.mimuw.edu.pl

Abstract. β-skeletons, a prominent member of the neighborhood graph family, have interesting geometric properties and various applications ranging from geographic networks to archeology. This paper focuses on developing a new, more general than the present one, definition of β-skeletons based only on the distance criterion. It allows us to consider them in many different cases, e.g. for weighted graphs or objects other than points. Two types of β-skeletons are especially well-known: the Gabriel Graph (for $\beta = 1$) and the Relative Neighborhood Graph (for $\beta = 2$). The new definition retains relations between those graphs and the other well-known ones (minimum spanning tree and Delaunay triangulation). We also show several new algorithms finding β-skeletons.

1 Introduction

The β-skeletons [KR85] in R^2 belong to the family of proximity graphs, geometric graphs in which two vertices (points) are connected with an edge if and only if they satisfy particular geometric requirements. In the case of β-skeletons, those requirements are dependent on a given parameter $\beta \geq 0$.

The β-skeletons are both important and popular because of many practical applications. The applications span a wide spectrum of areas: from geographic information systems to wireless ad hoc networks and machine learning. They also facilitate reconstructing shapes of two-dimension objects from sample points, and are also useful in finding the minimum weight triangulation of point sets.

Gabriel graphs (1-skeletons), defined by Gabriel and Sokal [GS69], are an example of β-skeletons for $\beta = 1$.

The *relative neighborhood graph* (RNG) is another example of the β-skeleton graph family, for $\beta = 2$. The RNG was introduced by Toussaint [Tou80] in the context of their applications in pattern recognition.

Kirkpatrick and Radke [KR85] proved an important theorem connecting β-skeletons with the minimum spanning tree $MST(V)$ and Delaunay triangulation $DT(V)$ of V :

Theorem 1. *Let us assume that points in V are in general position. For $1 \leq \beta \leq \beta' \leq 2$ following inclusions hold true: $MST(V) \subseteq RNG(V) \subseteq G_{\beta'}(V) \subseteq G_{\beta}(V) \subseteq GG(V) \subseteq DT(V)$.*

* This research is supported by the ESF EUROCORES programme EUROGIGA, CRP VORONOI.

According to this theorem, many algorithms computing Gabriel graphs and relative neighborhood graphs in subquadratic time were created [MS84,Su83,JK87,JKY89,L94].

There are very few algorithms for Gabriel graphs and relative neighborhood graphs in metrics different than the euclidean one ([MG11,W06]). In particular, β-skeletons in different metrics have not been studied and this paper makes an initial effort to fill this gap. Our main purpose of this paper is to develop a definition of β-skeleton based only on the distance criterion. Moreover, β-skeletons defined in a new way fulfill all conditions of Theorem 1.

Two different forms of β-neighborhoods have been studied for $\beta > 1$ (see for example [ABE98,E02]) leading to two different families of β-skeletons: lens-based β-skeletons and circle-based β-skeletons. The new definition of β-skeletons can be used in both cases. However, in this work, we focus on the lens-based β-skeletons.

The paper is organized as follows. The definition and basic properties of β-skeletons are introduced in Section 2. In Section 3 we present a distance based definition of a β-skeleton in l_p metrics. In Section 4 we discuss a problem of not uniquely defined centers of discs determining regions of a β-skeleton. Then, we consider β-skeletons in weighted graphs. In the next section we describe a case when the generators of the regions are not uniquely defined. In Section 7 we formulate the definition of the generalized β-skeletons. In Section 8 we present some algorithms computing generalized β-skeletons for cases discussed in the previous sections. The last section contains open problems and conclusions.

2 Preliminaries

We consider a two-dimensional plane R^2 with the l_p metric (with distance function d_p), where $1 < p < \infty$.

Definition 1. *[KR85] For a given set of points $V = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$ in R^2 and parameters $\beta \geq 0$ and p we define graph $G_\beta(V)$ – called a lens-based β-skeleton – as follows: two points v_1, v_2 are connected with an edge if and only if no point from $V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$ belongs to the set $N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ where:*

1. *for $\beta = 0$, $N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ is equal to the segment v_1v_2;*
2. *for $0 < \beta < 1$, $N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ is the intersection of two discs in l_p, each of them has radius $\frac{d_p(v_1v_2)}{2\beta}$ and whose boundaries contain both v_1 and v_2;*
3. *for $1 \leq \beta < \infty$, $N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ is the intersection of two l_p discs, each with radius $\frac{\beta d_p(v_1v_2)}{2}$, whose centers are in points $(\frac{\beta}{2})v_1 + (1 - \frac{\beta}{2})v_2$ and in $(1 - \frac{\beta}{2})v_1 + (\frac{\beta}{2})v_2$, respectively;*
4. *for $\beta = \infty$, $N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ is the unbounded strip between lines perpendicular to the segment v_1v_2 and containing v_1 and v_2.*

The region $N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ is called a lens (the name of the skeleton type, used in the literature, i.e. lune-based, is descended from the complement of the lens to the disc which looks like a lune - see Figure 1).

Furthermore, we can consider open or closed $N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ regions that lead to *an open* or *closed β-skeletons*. For example, the *Gabriel graph* is the closed 1-skeleton and the *relative neighborhood graph* is the open 2-skeleton.

In a similar way we can define a different family of graphs by changing the lens-based definition for $\beta > 1$. This new family of graphs is called circle-based β-skeletons.

Definition 2. *[E02] For a given set of points $V = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$ in R^2 and parameters $\beta \geq 0$ and p we define graph $G^c_\beta(V)$ – called a circle-based β-skeleton – as follows: two points v_1, v_2 are connected with an edge if and only if no point from $V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$ belongs to the set $N^c_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ where:*

1. *for $\beta < 1$ we define set $N^c_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ the same way as for lens-based β-skeleton;*
2. *for $1 \leq \beta < \infty$ the set $N^c_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ is a union of two discs in l_p, each with radius $\frac{\beta d_p(v_1 v_2)}{2}$, whose boundaries contain both v_1 and v_2;*
3. *for $\beta = \infty$, $N^c_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ is a union of the segment $v_1 v_2$ and two open hyperplanes defined by the line passing by v_1 and v_2.*

In this work we generally focus on lens-based β-skeletons.



Fig. 1. Lenses of the β-skeleton for $0 < \beta < 1$ (a), the lens-based skeleton (b) and the circle-based skeleton (c) for $1 \leq \beta \leq \infty$.

3 Distance based definition of β-skeletons

To describe β-skeletons for $\beta \in \{0, \infty\}$ in the remaining part of this paper we will use the definition of Painleve-Kuratowski convergence [K66]:

Definition 3. *Let X be a space with metric d, $\{S_n\}_{n \in N}$ be a sequence of subsets in X and for any $x \in X$ there is $d(x, S_n) = inf\{d(x, s) | s \in S_n\}$. Then:*

1. *the upper (outer) limit* $\limsup_{n\to\infty} S_n$ *of* $\{S_n\}$ *is defined as a such a set that:* $\limsup_{n\to\infty} S_n = \{p \in X | \liminf d(p, S_n) = 0\}$*;*
2. *the lower (inner) limit* $\limsup_{n\to\infty} S_n$ *of* $\{S_n\}$ *is such a set that:* $\liminf_{n\to\infty} S_n = \{p \in X | \limsup d(p, S_n) = 0\}$*; The sequence* $\{S_n\}_{n\in N}$ *is said to be convergent in the sense of Painleve-Kuratowski and denoted as* $\lim_{n\to\infty} S_n = S$ *if* $\limsup_{n\to\infty} S_n = \liminf_{n\to\infty} S_n = S$*.*

The regions $N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ are uniquely defined in l_p metric for each $0 < \beta < \infty$. Therefore $\lim_{\beta\to 0} N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ and $\lim_{\beta\to\infty} N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ are also unique and for any two points $v_1, v_2 \in V$ we have $\lim_{\beta\to 0} N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta) = N_p(v_1, v_2, 0)$ and $\lim_{\beta\to\infty} N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta) = N_p(v_1, v_2, \infty)$.

Let us consider lens-based β-skeletons in l_p metric, where $\beta \geq 1$. Let c_1 (c_2, respectively) be the center of a disc defining the lens $N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ and $d_p(v_1, c_1) = \frac{\beta d_p(v_1 v_2)}{2}$ ($d_p(v_2, c_2) = \frac{\beta d_p(v_1 v_2)}{2}$, respectively). It is easy to notice that $d_p(c_1, c_2) = (\beta-1)d_p(v_1, v_2)$ and $d_p(v_1, c_2) = d_p(v_2, c_1) = |\frac{(\beta-2)d_p(v_1 v_2)}{2}|$.

Lemma 1. *Let* c_1, c_2 *be points in* R^2 *with a* l_p *metric, where* $1 < p < \infty$, $d_p(c_1, c_2) = (\beta - 1)d_p(v_1, v_2)$ *and* $d_p(v_1, c_2) = d_p(v_2, c_1) = |\frac{(\beta-2)d_p(v_1 v_2)}{2}|$ *. Then, the points* c_1, c_2 *are centers of discs determining the lens* $N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$*.*

Proof. For $1 \leq \beta < 2$ we have $d_p(v_2, c_1) + d_p(c_1, c_2) + d_p(v_1, c_2) = 2|\frac{(\beta-2)d_p(v_1 v_2)}{2}| + (\beta - 1)d_p(v_1, v_2) = (2 - \beta)d_p(v_1, v_2) + (\beta - 1)d_p(v_1, v_2) = d_p(v_1, v_2)$. For $2 \leq \beta < \infty$ we have $d_p(v_2, c_1) + d_p(v_1, v_2) + d_p(v_1, C_2) = 2|\frac{(\beta-2)d_p(v_1 v_2)}{2}| + d_p(v_1, v_2) = (\beta - 2)d_p(v_1, v_2) + d_p(v_1, v_2) = (\beta-1)d_p(v_1, v_2) = d_p(c_1, c_2)$. Hence, the points v_1, v_2, c_1, c_2 are colinear. Moreover, from the triangle inequality it follows that in an arbitrary metric for $1 \leq \beta < 2$ is $\frac{\beta d_p(v_1 v_2)}{2} = d_p(v_1, c_2) + d_p(c_1, c_2) \geq d_p(v_1, c_1) \geq d_p(v_1, v_2) - d_p(v_2, c_1) = \frac{\beta d_p(v_1 v_2)}{2}$ and for $2 \leq \beta < \infty$ is $\frac{\beta d_p(v_1 v_2)}{2} = d_p(v_2, c_1) + d_p(v_1, v_2) \geq d_p(v_1, c_1) \geq d_p(c_1, c_2) - d_p(v_1, c_2) = \frac{\beta d_p(v_1 v_2)}{2}$ The same relations occur for $d_p(v_2, c_2)$. Hence $d_p(v_1, c_1) = d_p(v_2, c_2) = \frac{\beta d_p(v_1 v_2)}{2}$ (discs defining the lens have the radius $\frac{\beta d_p(v_1 v_2)}{2}$), i.e. the lens is $N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$.

Corollary 1. *Distance conditions in Definition 1 for* $0 < \beta < 1$ *and in Lemma 1 for* $1 \leq \beta < \infty$ *correctly define lenses of* β*-skeletons for* $0 < \beta < \infty$*. The Painleve-Kuratowski convergence correctly defines lenses of* β*-skeletons for* $\beta = 0$ *and* $\beta = \infty$*.*

4 Not uniquely defined centers of the discs determining lens

Note that for metrics l_1 and l_∞ corollary 1 is not true, since centers of discs determining a lens can be defined not uniquely. Let us assume that points belonging to V are in general position. For $1 \leq \beta < \infty$, intersection of circles centered in v_1 and v_2 with radiuses $|\frac{(\beta-2)d_p(v_1 v_2)}{2}|$ and $\frac{\beta d_p(v_1 v_2)}{2}$, respectively, contains may points. If a line passing through v_1

and v_2 is parallel to sides of squares being discs in l_1 or l_∞ then centers of discs determining a lens for $0 < \beta < 1$ are not uniquely defined too.

We will concentrate on l_1 metric and describe what should be modified in the definition of the β-skeleton to be able to use it also in this metric. The consideration concerning l_∞ metric are exactly the same.

In this case we analyze lens defined by discs with centers satisfying the conditions below.

For $v_1, v_2 \in V$ and $0 < \beta < 1$, the points c_1 and c_2 are centers of discs defining $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ when $d_1(c_1, v_1) = d_1(c_2, v_1) = d_1(c_1, v_2) = d_1(c_2, v_2) = \frac{d_1(v_1,v_2)}{2\beta}$ and each shortest path connecting c_1 and c_2 intersects some shortest path between v_1 and v_2 (the second condition guarantees that v_1 and v_2 are ends of the lens just like in l_p). Note that the shortest path between two points in l_1 does not have to be a segment.

For $1 \leq \beta < \infty$ the points c_1 and c_2 are centers of discs defining a lens $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ when $d_p(c_1, c_2) = (\beta - 1)d_p(v_1, v_2)$ and $d_p(v_1, c_2) = d_p(v_2, c_1) = |\frac{(\beta-2)d_p(v_1v_2)}{2}|$.

From now on we will alternately use a symbol $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ for description of concrete lens (one element set) or for a set of lenses defined for an edge v_1v_2.

Lemma 2. *For $v_1, v_2 \in V$ and for $0 < \beta < \beta' < 1$ there is $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta) = N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta')$.*

Proof. Note that if points v_1 and v_2 are not on a line parallel to sides of a square being a circle in l_1 then points c_1 and c_2 are defined uniquely and the lens $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ is a rectangle with opposite vertices in points v_1, v_2 and sides parallel to sides of a square being a circle in l_1 (see Figure 2).
In other case, there are more than two points belonging to the intersection of discs with radius $\frac{d_1(v_1,v_2)}{2\beta}$ and centers in points v_1 and v_2. However, there are only two pairs of points c_1, c_2 for which each shortest path connecting c_1 and c_2 intersects some shortest path between v_1 and v_2. Both pairs define the same lens and $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta) = v_1v_2$.

Note that $N_1(v_1, v_2, 0)$ is uniquely defined for any v_1, v_2 and $N_1(v_1, v_2, 0) = N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ for $0 < \beta < 1$.

Lemma 3. *For any two points $v_1, v_2 \in V$ a lens $N_1(v_1, v_2, 2)$ is uniquely defined. For $\beta > 2$ there exists a lens $N \in N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ such that $N = N_1(v_1, v_2, 2)$. Moreover, $N_1(v_1, v_2, 2)$ is contained in every lens in $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$.*

Proof. For $\beta = 2$ we have $c_1 = v_2$ and $c_2 = v_1$. Let $y(v)$ ($x(v)$, respectively) denote a value of y-coordinate (x-coordinate, respectively) of a point v. Let us assume that $|y(v_1) - y(v_2)| \leq |x(v_1) - x(v_2)|$. It is easy to notice that for $\beta > 2$ and centers c_1, c_2 of discs defining a lens $N \in N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ such that $y(c_1) = y(v_1)$ and $y(c_2) = y(v_1)$ we have $N = N_1(v_1, v_2, 2)$. Lenses in $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ are an rectangles. Points v_1 and v_2 lie on their opposite sides (see Figure 2). Since $d_p(c_1, c_2) = (\beta - 1)d_p(v_1, v_2)$ we have $|y(c_1) - y(c_2)| \geq |y(v_1) - y(v_2)|$. If the difference $|y(c_1) - y(c_2)|$ grows then the opposite vertices of the lens drive away.

Hence $N_1(v_1, v_2, 2)$ is contained in each lens from $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$. A similar argumentation in respect of x-coordinates is true when $|x(v_1) - x(v_2)| < |y(v_1) - y(v_2)|$.

Lemma 4. *For $v_1, v_2 \in V$ and $1 < \beta < 2$ all lenses from $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ are included in $N_1(v_1, v_2, 2)$. For $1 < \beta < 2$ there exist two lenses $N, N' \in N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ such that each of them does not contain any lens from $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta) \setminus \{N, N'\}$, $N \cup N' = N_1(v_1, v_2, 2)$ and $N \cap N' \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let us assume that $|y(v_1)-y(v_2)| \leq |x(v_1)-x(v_2)|$ and $x(v_1) < x(v_2), y(v_1) < y(v_2)$. Centers of discs determining lenses in $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ belong to the rectangle $[x(v_1), x(v_2)] \times [y(v_1), y(v_2)]$. Therefore each such a disc is contained in one of the discs determining $N_1(v_1, v_2, 2)$. Hence, each lens from $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ is included in $N_1(v_1, v_2, 2)$. Let c_1, c_2 be centers of discs determining a lens in $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$. The lens has minimum size when $x(c_1) = x(c_2)$ or $y(c_1) = y(c_2)$. Those lenses are in extreme positions when $y(c_1) = y(c_2) = y(v_1)$ or $y(c_1) = y(c_2) = y(v_2)$. Three sides of the first and the second lens are contained in sides of $N_1(v_1, v_2, 2)$. Both lenses contain vertices v_1 and v_2. Hence, their intersection is not empty and their sum is $N_1(v_1, v_2, 2)$. A similar argumentation in respect of x-coordinates is true when $|x(v_1) - x(v_2)| < |y(v_1) - y(v_2)|$.



Fig. 2. Lenses in l_1 metric: (a) $0 < \beta < 1$, (b) $1 < \beta < 2$, (c) $2 < \beta < \infty$.

Corollary 2. *For a given set of points V and the parameter $0 \leq \beta \leq \infty$ the graph $G^1_\beta(V)$ is a set of edges such that $v_1v_2 \in G^1_\beta(V)$ if and only if there exists a lens $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ that no point from $V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$ belongs to it. $G^1_\beta(V)$ is called β-skeleton in l_1. For any $\beta < 1$ we have $G^1_\beta(V) = G^1_0(V)$ and for any $\beta \geq 2$ there is $G^1_\beta(V) = G^1_2(V)$.*

Finally, we can prove that:

Lemma 5. *For $1 \leq \beta \leq \beta' \leq 2$ in l_1 metric we have:*
$MST(V) \subseteq G^1_{\beta'}(V) \subseteq G^1_{\beta}(V) \subseteq DT(V)$.

Proof. Let c_1, c_2 be centers of discs determining a lens $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta)$. Let c'_1 be a point such that $d_1(v_1, c'_1) = \frac{\beta'}{\beta} d_1(v_1, c_1)$ and $d_1(v_1, c'_1) + d_1(v_2, c'_1) = d_1(v_1, v_2)$ and $x(c'_1) = x(c_1)$ or $y(c'_1) = y(c_1)$ (one of such choices is always possible). Then disc with center in c'_1 and radius $d_1(v_1, c'_1)$ contains a disc with center in c_1 and radius $d_1(v_1, c_1)$. In the same way we define a disc center c'_2. Then c'_1, c'_2 are centers of discs determining a lens $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta')$ and $N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta) \subseteq N_1(v_1, v_2, \beta')$. Hence $G^1_{\beta'}(V) \subseteq G^1_{\beta}(V)$.
The other inclusions can be proved in the same way as in the paper by Kirkpatrick and Radke [KR85].

Corollary 3. *Let $GG_1(V)$ and $G_{MG}(V)$ be Gabriel graphs defined in [W06] and [MG11], respectively. Then $GG_1(V) \subseteq G_{MG}(V) \subseteq G^1_1(V)$.*

5 β-skeletons for weighted graphs

Let $G = (V, U, E)$ be a connected, edge-weighted graph in the plane, where $U \subseteq V$ is a subset of the set of vertices of G. Each edge of $e \in E$ is labelled with a positive weight $w(e)$. The distance $d_G(p, q)$ between two points p and q of G is the minimum total weight of any path connecting p and q in G. Graph G with the distance function d_G is a metric space.
The closed disc $D_G(p, r)$ is defined as the set of points q of G for which $d_p(p, q) \leq r$.

Abrego et al. [A12] defined Minimum Spanning Tree and Delaunay Graph of G in the following way:

Definition 4. *A minimum spanning tree of $G = (V, U, E)$ is a tree $T = (U, F)$ such that the sum of $d_G(u_i, u_j)$ over all edges $u_i u_j \in F$ is minimal.*

The Delaunay graph of $G = (V, U, E)$, denoted by DG(U), is the graph $H = (U, F)$ such that $(u_i, u_j) \in F$ if and only if there exists a closed disc $D_G(p, r)$, where p is a point of G, containing u_i and u_j and no other vertex from U.

Let us assume (like [A12]) that the shortest paths between each pair vertices in U is uniquely defined. Similarly as in the previous Section we can define lenses $N_w(u_1, u_2, \beta)$ for edges of the graph G. Unfortunately, lenses for $\beta < 1$ can be defined only for particular kinds of graphs (for each edge $u_1 u_2$ connecting vertices in U a cycle of $d_G(u_1, u_2)(1 + \frac{1}{\beta})$ length has to occur). Since the total weight of edges is limited lenses for a big value of β do not exist either. Therefore we can define a β-skeleton $G^w_\beta(U)$ like in the Section 4 only in a limited range.

Lemma 6. *Let $d_G(c(u_1u_2))$ denote the length of the shortest circle containing the edge u_1u_2. The β-skeletons $G^w_\beta(U)$ for weighted graphs are correctly defined for $1 \leq \beta \leq \min_{u_1,u_2 \in U} \frac{d_G(c(u_1u_2))}{2d_G(u_1u_2)} + 1$.*

Proof. A distance between centers of discs determining a lens $N_w(u_1, u_2, \beta)$ should be $(\beta - 1)d_G(u_1u_2)$. Hence, $d_G(c(u_1u_2)) \geq 2(\beta - 1)d_G(u_1u_2)$, i.e. $\beta \leq \frac{d_G(c(u_1u_2))}{2d_G(u_1u_2)} + 1$.
Then for $1 \leq \beta < \beta' \leq \min_{u_1,u_2 \in U} \frac{d_G(c(u_1u_2))}{2d_G(u_1u_2)} + 1$ and any $z_1, z_2 \in U$ if a lens $N \in N_w(z_1, z_2, \beta)$ then there exists a lens $N' \in N_w(z_1, z_2, \beta')$ such that $N \subseteq N'$.

Note that $\frac{d_G(c(u_1u_2))}{2d_G(u_1u_2)} + 1 \geq \frac{2d_G(u_1u_2)}{2d_G(u_1u_2)} + 1 = 2$. Hence $GG(U)$ and $RNG(U)$ are correctly defined.

Lemma 7. *For $1 \leq \beta < \beta' \leq 2$ and for every graph $G = (V, U, E)$ the following inequalities occur:*
$MST(U) \subseteq RNG(U) \subseteq G^w_{\beta'}(U) \subseteq G^w_\beta(U) \subseteq GG(U) \subseteq DG(U)$,
where $RNG(U) = G^w_2(U)$ and $GG(U) = G^w_1(U)$.

Proof. According to Lemma 6 inclusions $RNG(U) \subseteq G^w_\beta(U) \subseteq G^w_{\beta'}(U) \subseteq GG(U) \subseteq DG(U)$ are true. The other inclusions were proved by Abrego et al. [A12].



Fig. 3. Lenses in the weighted graph (each edge has the same weight) for different values of β.

6 Not uniquely defined generators of lenses

In previous sections, we considered β-skeletons such that centers of discs determining lenses were defined depending on position and distance of points from V. Those points generated sets of lenses. What will happen when we replace points with objects, e.g. clusters of points or segments ? We will study this problem focusing on the case of segments.

Let us consider a set S of n segments and the l_p metric, where $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. For two segments $s_1, s_2 \in S$ and a parameter $0 < \beta < \infty$ we define $N^s_p(s_1, s_2, \beta)$ as a set of lenses $N_p(v_1, v_2, \beta)$, where v_1, v_2 are points such that $v_1 \in s_1$ and $v_2 \in s_2$.

Definition 5. *For a given set of segments S and given parameters $0 \leq \beta$ and $0 \leq p \leq \infty$ we define a graph $G^s_\beta(S)$such that an edge between segments s_1 and s_2 exists if and only if there exists a lens in $N^s_p(s_1, s_2, \beta)$ whose intersection with $S \setminus \{s_1, s_2\}$ is empty.*

In order to define Delaunay triangulation we will use a definition by Brevilliers et al. [BCS08]:

Definition 6. *A segment triangulation $\mathcal{T}$ of S is such a partition of the convex hull $conv(S)$ of S in disjoint sites, edges and faces that:*

1. *Every face of $\mathcal{T}$ is an open triangle whose vertices are in three distinct sites of S and whose open edges do not intersect S,*
2. *No face can be added without intersecting another one,*
3. *The edges of T are the (possibly two-dimensional) connected components of $conv(S) \setminus (F \cup S)$, where F is the union of faces of $\mathcal{T}$.*

A segment triangulation of S is Delaunay $DT(S)$ if the circumcircle of each face does not contain any point of S in its interior (see Figure 4).



Fig. 4. Delaunay triangulation for a set of segments and a multigraph corresponding to it.

Note that we can present this triangulation as a multigraph $M = (V, E)$ with a set of vertices $V = S$, and a separate edge between vertices s_1 and s_2 for each edge in $DT(S)$ connecting segments s_1 and s_2 (see Figure 4). Each such edge in the graph can be labelled with the length of the shortest path between two points of a given edge in $DT(S)$ belonging to opposite segments.

We can formulate the following lemma.

Lemma 8. *For $1 \leq \beta \leq \beta' \leq 2$ we have:*
$MST(S) \subseteq RNG(S) \subseteq G^s_{\beta'}(S) \subseteq G^s_{\beta}(S) \subseteq GG(S) \subseteq DT(S)$,
where $RNG(S) = G^s_2(S), GG(S) = G^s_1(S)$ and $MST(S)$ is a minimum spanning tree for a set of segments S.

Proof. We want to show that $GG(S) \subseteq DT(S)$. Let $v_1 \in s_2, v_2 \in s_2$ be such a pair of points that there is a l_p disc D with diameter v_1v_2 containing no points from segments from $S \setminus \{s_1, s_2\}$ inside of it. We transform D by homothety in respect of v_1 so that its image D' would be tangent to s_2 in t. Then we transform D' by homothety in respect of t so that its image D'' would be tangent to s_1 (see Figure 5). The disc D'' lies inside of D, i.e. it does not intersect segments from $S \setminus \{s_1, s_2\}$, and is tangent to s_1 and s_2. Hence, if the edge s_1s_2 belongs to $GG(S)$ then it also belongs to $DT(S)$.
Let c_1, c_2 be centers of discs determining a lens $N \in N_p(s_1, s_2, \beta)$. Let c'_1 (c'_2, respectively) be an image of c_1 (c_2, respectively) by homothety with the factor $\frac{\beta'}{\beta}$ in respect of point v_1 (v_2, respectively). Then c'_1, c'_2 are centers of discs determining a lens $N' \in N_p(s_1, s_2, \beta')$ and $N \subseteq N'$). Hence $G^s_{\beta'}(V) \subseteq G^s_{\beta}(V)$.
The last inclusion can be proved in the same way as in the paper by Kirkpatrick and Radke [KR85].



Fig. 5. $G^s_{\beta}(S) \subseteq DT(S)$.

7 Generalized β-skeletons

Finally, we can formulate the definition of the generalized β-skeletons:

Definition 7. *For a given set of objects S in space X with a metric d and for parameters $0 \leq \beta \leq \infty$ we define a graph $G_\beta(S)$ - called generalized β-skeleton - as follows: two objects s_1 and s_2 are connected with an edge if and only if at least one lens in $N_d(s_1, s_2, \beta)$ is not intersected by any object from $S \setminus \{s_1, s_2\}$ where:*

- *for* $0 < \beta < 1$ *a lens* $N_d(v_1, v_2, \beta) \in N_d(s_1, s_2, \beta)$*, where* $v_1 \in s_1$ *and* $v_2 \in s_2$*, is the intersection of two discs, each of them has radius* $\frac{d(v_1,v_2)}{2\beta}$*, whose boundaries contain both* v_1 *and* v_2 *and each shortest path connecting their centers intersects some shortest path between* v_1 *and* v_2*,*

- *for* $1 \leq \beta < \infty$ *a lens* $N_d(v_1, v_2, \beta) \in N_d(s_1, s_2, \beta)$*, where* $v_1 \in s_1$ *and* $v_2 \in s_2$*, is the intersection of two discs with centers* c_1 *and* c_2*, respectively, such that* $d(c_1, c_2) = (\beta - 1)d(v_1, v_2)$ *and* $d(v_1, c_2) = d(v_2, c_1) = |\frac{(\beta-2)d(v_1v_2)}{2}|$*.*

- *for* $\beta = 0$ *(*$\beta = \infty$*, respectively) a lens* $N_d(v_1, v_2, 0) \in N_d(s_1, s_2, 0)$*, (*$N_d(v_1, v_2, \infty) \in N_d(s_1, s_2, \infty)$*, respectively), where* $v_1 \in s_1$ *and* $v_2 \in s_2$*, we have* $N_d(v_1, v_2, 0) = \lim_{\beta\to 0} N_d(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ *and* $N_d(v_1, v_2, \infty) = \lim_{\beta\to\infty} N_d(v_1, v_2, \beta)$*.*

Note that in the similar way we can modify the definition of circle-based β-skeleton. Moreover, the definition (in both cases) can be applied in multidimensional spaces. For example, for $0 < \beta < 1$ in R^n, where $n \geq 2$, regions $N(v_1, v_2, \beta)$ are determined by spheres which centers are located symmetrically in respect of the edge v_1v_2.

8 Algorithms

In this section we will describe algorithms computing β-skeletons in above considered situations.

We will start from β-skeletons in R^2 with l_1 metric. According to Lemma 2 for $0 < \beta < 1$ the lenses are unique defined. Moreover, the points from V are their vertices.
We rotate plane to obtain axis-aligned lenses. Then we use a plane sweep algorithm. We sweep from left to right. The event structure contains a x-ordered set V. The state structure contains for each $w \in V$ y-ordered, labelled by w, list of vertices lying on the right from v. When the sweep line reaches a vertex v we remove from each list being in the state structure all points lying on the opposite side of v than a vertex labelling the list. If v is on the list we remove them and we add an edge connecting v with a vertex being a label

of the list to the set of solutions (see Algorithm 1).

```
Input: rotated plane and a set of points V
Output: a set E of all edges of β-skeleton for V
create list X = {x_1, ..., x_n} of all vertices sorted by their x-coordinate from left to right;
for all vertices p ∈ V do
    create a list Υ(p) of vertices that follow p in the X list, sorted by their y-coordinates;
end
for i = 2 to n do
    for j = 1 to i − 1 do
        remove from the list Υ(x_j) all vertices that are separated from x_j on the this list by x_i;
        if the first not deleted element on the list Υ(x_j) is x_i then
            add (x_i, x_j) to E;
            remove x_i from Υ(x_j);
        end
    end
end
```

Algorithm 1: Algorithm computing $G^1_\beta(V)$ for $0 < \beta < 1$

Theorem 2. *For a given $0 < \beta < 1$ and a set V of n points in R^2 with l_1 metric the β-skeleton $G^1_\beta(V)$ can be computed in $O(n^2)$ time.*

Proof. We can rotate and sort points of V in $O(n \log n)$ time. Lists $Y(x_i)$ can be prepared in total $O(n^2)$ time. Time needed for loops activity is $\Sigma_{v \in V} O(k_i + 1)$, where k_i is a number of deleted elements in i-th turn of the first loop. Since $\Sigma_{v \in V} O(k_i) = O(n^2)$, the algorithm complexity is $O(n^2)$.

Based on Lemmas 4 and 3 it follows that if an edge v_1v_2 belongs to a β-skeleton for $1 \leq \beta < \infty$ then there exist a lens N such that $N \cap V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\} = \emptyset$ and $N \subseteq N_1(v_1, v_2, 2)$. Moreover, for $1 \leq \beta < 2$ the lens N is one of two extremal lenses or it lies between points eliminating those lenses.
Let us rotate plane to obtain axis-aligned lenses. Let us consider a lens such that points of V generating it lie on the top and bottom sides of the lens. To solve the problem, it is sufficient to find leftmost point in rightmost lens and rightmost point in leftmost lens. Then we can verify if the distance between those points is big enough. Note that any point from V inside $N_1(v_1, v_2, 2)$ eliminates an edge v_1v_2 from β-skeleton for $2 \leq \beta < \infty$. According to Lemma 5 a β-skeleton is a subset of $DT(V)$. Hence we have to analyze only $O(n)$ lenses.
We use a plane sweep algorithm. We will sweep a plane to the right analyzing rightmost lenses and next to the left analyzing leftmost ones. The event structure contains positions of V elements and sides od lenses sorted in respect of x-coordinate. The state structure is an interval tree with n leaves corresponding to points of V. In nodes we will save information about swept lenses. If a sweep line visit a lens we mark a node being a lowest ancestor of leaves corresponding to the top and bottom sides of analyzed lens (see Figure 6). If a sweep line reaches a point $v \in V$ we find a path from a root of the tree to a leaf corresponding

to v. We allocate the point to all lenses marked on this path. Then we erase the markers. If the sweep line leaves the lens we erase the corresponding marker from the tree (if the marker exists).



Fig. 6. A plane sweep algorithm for $G^1_\beta(V)$, where $1 \leq \beta < \infty$. sweep line ecounters a lens side (a) or a point of V (b).

Input: rotated plane with rightmost lenses and a set of points V
Output: leftmost points belonging to rightmost lenses

while *there are still unvisited points from* V *or lens sides* **do**
  sweep the plane from left to right;
  if *ecounter a lens side* **then**
    mark a node in the interval tree corresponding to the side of the lens;
  end
  if *ecounter a point* v **then**
    find a path from the root of tree to the leaf corresponding to v;
    for *each lens mark* N *on the path* **do**
      save the pair (v, N) and erase N from the tree
    end
  end
  if *leave a lens* **then**
    remove mark N (if it exists) from the tree ;
  end
end

Algorithm 2: Algorithm computing leftmost points belonging to rightmost lenses

Theorem 3. *For a given* $1 \leq \beta < \infty$ *and a set* V *of* n *points in* R^2 *with* l_1 *metric the* β*-skeleton* $G^1_\beta(V)$ *can be computed in* $O(n \log n)$ *time.*

Proof. We use a plane sweep algorithm four times (two times in each direction after clockwise and counterclockwise rotation of the plane - depending on a slope of edges generating lenses). The number of events is $O(n)$. The i-th event needs $O(\log n + k_i O(\ logn))$ time, where k_i is a number of added or removed marks. Since $\Sigma k_i = O(n)$, the algorithm complexity is $O(1) \times (O(n \log n) + O(n \log n)) = O(n \log n)$

Now, we will present an algorithm computing $G^w_\beta(U)$ for a weighted graph $G = (V, U, E)$. The algorithm is natural. First we compute distances between all vertices in G using e.g.

Johnson's algorithm [CLRS]. Then we find a set of points which are candidates for centers of disc determining lenses. For this purpose we analyze distances of two points generating lens from point belonging to any edge. Next, we verify which pairs of candidates can create lenses (a ratio of a distance between centers of discs determining lens to a distance between generators is $(\beta - 1)$). In the last step analyze an intersection of a set U with each lens. Unfortunately, the algorithm is expensive due to a big number of possible lenses.

Lemma 9. *A number of all candidates for centers of disc determining lenses is $O(m^2)$, where $m = |E|$.*

Proof. Let us assume that $|V| = n$, n is even, $V = C_1 \cup C_2$, $|C_1| = |C_2|$, sets C_1 and C_2 form cycles which every second element belongs to U. One edge of C_1 has a big weight. Edges connecting vertices of $C_1 \setminus U$ with vertices of C_2 also have a big weight (see Figure 7).
Hence the graph G has $m = O(n^2)$ edges. For a sufficiently big value of parameter β and each of $O(n-k)$ pairs vertices generating a lens, which are connected by $2k$ short edges, there exist $O(n-k) \times O(n)$ edges containing candidates for disc centers. Hence, the total number of candidates is $\Sigma_{k=1}^{n-1} O(n-k) \times O(n-k) \times O(n) = O(n^4) = O(m^2)$.



Fig. 7. An example of many centers of disc determining lenses for generators v_1, v_2.

Input: weighted graph $G = (V, U, E)$, parameter $\beta \geq 1$
Output: set F of all edges of β-skeleton for G

compute all distances in graph G between vertices in V;
for *every edge* u_1u_2 **do**
  find all potential centers $\texttt{PotCen}(u_1, u_2)$ for u_1u_2;
  for *every pair* $c_1, c_2 \in \texttt{PotCen}(u_1, u_2)$ **do**
    if $d_G(c_1, c_2) = (\beta - 1)d_G(u_1, u_2)$ **then**
      add pair (c_1, c_2) to $\texttt{A}(u_1, u_2)$;
    end
  end
  for *every pair* $(c_1, c_2) \in \texttt{A}(u_1, u_2)$ **do**
    if *lens defined by* c_1, c_2 *is empty* **then**
      add u_1u_2 to F;
    end
  end
end

Algorithm 3: Algorithm for computing β-skeleton for $\beta \geq 1$ for weighted graphs

Theorem 4. *Let* $d_G(c(u_1u_2))$ *denote the length of the shortest circle containing the edge* u_1u_2 *in the weighted graph* $G = (V, U, E)$. *For* $1 \leq \beta \leq \min_{u_1,u_2 \in U} \frac{d_G(c(u_1u_2))}{2d_G(u_1u_2)} + 1$ *the* β*-skeleton* $G^w_\beta(U)$ *can be computed in* $O(nm^3)$ *time, where* $|V| = n$ *and* $|E| = m$.

Proof. The most time-consuming is the last part of the algorithm, i.e. verification of emptiness of lenses. For one pair of generators there are at most $O(m)$ candidates for centers of disc determining lenses. Hence, there are $O(m) \times O(m^2) = O(m^3)$ lenses to verify. The total algorithm complexity is $O(nm^3)$.

Corollary 4. *For* $\beta = 2$ *the* β*-skeleton* $G^w_\beta(U)$ *can be computed in* $O(n^3)$ *time.*

Proof. Centers of disc determining lenses for RNG are uniquely defined. There are points of U. Since $|U| = O(n)$, there are at most $O(n^2)$ lenses. Complexity of the Johnson's algorithm id $O(nm)$. Hence, the total complexity of the algorithm is $O(nm) + O(n^3) = O(n^3)$.

The most interesting and difficult is an algorithm computing β-skeletons for a set S of n segments in R^2 with L_2 metric. We will outline the solution. Details can be found in the paper [KM14]. Let us consider a set of parametrized lines containing given segments. A line $P(s_i)$ contains a segment $s_i \in S$ and its parametrization is $(x^i_1, y^i_1) + t_i \times [x^i_2 - x^i_1, y^i_2 - y^i_1]$, where (x^i_1, y^i_1) and (x^i_2, y^i_2) are ends of the segment s_i. Let s_1 and s_2 be generators of a lens. We shoot a rays from points $q(t_1) \in P(s_1)$. Let us assume that the rays pass through a point $h \in s$, where $s \in S \setminus \{s_1, s_2\}$. For $0 < \beta < 1$ the ray reflects. The sum of angle of incidence and angle of reflection is equal to an inscribed angle for a lens generated for a given value of β. For $1 \leq \beta < \infty$ we compute a new line perpendicular to the ray such that a distance between an intersection point r and the point $q(t_1)$ is $d(p, q(t_1)) = \frac{1}{\beta} d(h, q(t_1))$. Both new created lines will be called reflected rays. The reflected ray intersects line $P(s_2)$ in point $w(t_2)$. A relation between parameters t_1 and t_2 is a hyperbolic function. For a given

segment $s \in S \setminus \{s_1, s_2\}$, hyperbolas for points $h \in s$ create hyperbolic stripe. Intersection of this stripe with a hyperbolic stripe describing relation between parameters t_2 and t_1 is a polygon whose sides are parts of hyperbolas (see Figure 8).



Fig. 8. Rays for computing of *RNG* (a), hyperbolic polygon (b).

Theorem 5. *An edge generated by segments s_1 and s_2 belongs to β-skeleton $G^s_\beta(S)$ if and only iff a sum of polygons computed for all segments $s \in S \setminus \{s_1, s_2\}$ does not cover a square* $[0,1] \times [0,1]$.

Proof. If there exists an uncovered point $(t_1, t_2) \in [0,1] \times [0,1]$, then a lens generated for points $q(t_1)$ and $w(t_2)$ does not intersect any segment in $S \setminus \{s_1, s_2\}$. The opposite implication also is true.

Theorem 6. *The β-skeleton $G^s_\beta(S)$ for a set of n segments S in R^2 with L_2 metric can be computed for $0 < \beta < 1$ in $O(n^4)$ time and for $1 \leq \beta < \infty$ in $O(n^3)$ time.*

Proof. A sum of n polygons can be computed in $O(n^2)$ time. A verification $O(n^2)$ pairs of lens generators needs $O(n^4)$ time. According to Lemma 8 and linearity of $DT(S)$, for $1 \leq \beta < \infty$ we have to check only $O(n)$ pairs of generators. Hence, a complexity of the algorithm is $O(n^3)$.

For $\beta = 1$ we can use 2-order Voronoi diagrams for segments to compute $GG(S)$. In this case a complexity of the algorithm is $O(n \log n)$ [KM14].

9 Conclusions

In this paper we show a way of defining β-skeletons in general. We have based our proposition on a distance criterion and we described conditions should be satisfied if the lenses are not defined uniquely. We have focused our considerations only on a few special cases which in our opinion well describe the idea of this general definition. In a similar way, we can also define β-skeletons for example for a set of polygons or for the jungle river metric. It is also easy to generalize this definition for higher dimensions. One can consider a couple of new problems regarding this definition. It would be interesting to check how those changes can influence the time of algorithms computing β-skeletons. For example, if the RNG for segments could be computed faster than in $O(n^3)$ time. Many questions can also concern properties of β-skeletons which they have for different objects and their practical applications.

Acknowledgements
The authors would like to thank Evanthia Papadopoulou for important discussions. We thank Jerzy W. Jaromczyk for his comments and suggestions.

References

A12. B.M. brego, R. Fabila-Monroy, S. Fernndez-Merchant, D. Flores-Penaloza, F. Hurtado, H. Meijer, V. Sacristn, M. Saumell, *Proximity graphs inside large weighted graphs*, *Networks*,volume 2012, 2012

ABE98. N. Amenta, M.W. Bern, D. Eppstein, *The crust and the β-skeleton: combinatorial curve reconstruction*, *Graphical Models Image Processing*, 60/2 (2), 1998, 125-135

BCS08. M. Brevilliers, N. Chevallier, D. Schmitt, *Flip Algorithm for Segment Triangulations*, *Proceedings of the 33rd international symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*, 2008, 180-192

CLRS. T.H. Cormen, C.E. Leiserson, R.L. Rivest, C. Stein, *Introduction to Algorithms*, MIT Press, 2009

EKS83. H. Edelsbrunner, D.G. Kirkpatrick, R. Seidel, *On the shape of a set of points in the plane*, *Transaction on Information Theory*, volume 29, 1983, 551-559

E02. D. Eppstein, *β-skeletons have unbounded dilation*, *Computational Geometry*, vol. 23, 2002, 43-52

GS69. K.R. Gabriel, R.R. Sokal, *A new statistical approach to geographic variation analysis*, *Systematic Zoology* 18, 1969, 259-278

JK87. J.W. Jaromczyk, M. Kowaluk, *A note on relative neighborhood graphs*, *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry*, Canada, Waterloo, ACM Press, 1987, 233-241

JKY89. J.W. Jaromczyk, M. Kowaluk, F. Yao, *An optimal algorithm for constructing β-skeletons in l_p metric*, *Manuscript*, 1989

JT92. J.W. Jaromczyk, G.T. Toussaint, *Relative neighborhood graphs and their relatives*, *Proceedings of the IEEE*, volume 80, issue 9, 1992, 1502-1517

KR85. D.G. Kirkpatrick, J.D. Radke, *A framework for computational morphology*, *Computational Geometry*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1985, 217-248

KM14. M. Kowaluk, G. Majewska, *β-skeletons for a set of segments in R^2*, *Manuscript prepared for CCCG 2014*, 2014

K66. K. Kuratowski, *Topology*, Academic Press, New York, 1966

L94. A. Lingas. *A linear-time construction of the relative neighborhood graph from the Delaunay triangulation*, *Computational Geometry* 4, 1994, 199-208

MG11. L. Maignan, F. Gruau. *Gabriel Graphs in Arbitrary Metric Space and their Cellular Automaton for Many Grids*, *ACM Transactions on Autonomous and Adaptive Systems* 6 (2), 2011, 12:1-12:13

MS84. D.W. Matula, R.R. Sokal, *Properties of Gabriel graphs relevant to geographical variation research and the clustering of points in plane*, *Geographical Analysis* 12, 1984, 205-222

Su83. K.J. Supowit, *The relative neighborhood graph, with an application to minimum spanning trees*, *Journal of the ACM* volume 30, issue 3, 1983, 428-448

Tou80. G.T. Toussaint, *The relative neighborhood graph of a finite planar set*, *Pattern Recognition* 12, 1980, 261-268

W06. C. Wulff-Nilsen, *Proximity structures in the fixed orientation metrics*, *Proceedings of the EWCG 2006* 2006, 153-156